

Del Guercio found it in numbers on one to two-year-old shoots of *Larix* in the Park at Pratolino in the spring of 1907. It is quite distinct from any others seen by this Italian Aphidologist and is certainly not Walker's *Larix* species. I record it under Del Guercio's generic name.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE
BRITISH BRACONIDÆ.

No. 3.—MICROGASTERIDÆ.

By G. T. LYLE, F.E.S.

(Continued from p. 163.)

SECTION 1.

Simulans, sp. nov.

Black; palpi pale, belly at base, all the tibiæ and fore and middle femora testaceous; hind femora testaceous with apices above dark; tarsi pale fuscous; all the coxæ black or blackish, the hind pair subrugulose above. Antennæ of the female as long as the body. Mesothorax subrugulose, almost as deeply marked as the first and second abdominal segments; scutellum smoother; metathorax rather coarsely rugulose; wings somewhat clouded; stigma and nervures pale fuscous; first segment of the abdomen truncate, at the apex almost as broad as 2, narrowed towards base, 2 slightly shorter than 3, first and second rugulose, the remainder smooth and shining; spurs of the hind tibiæ shorter than half the metatarsus; *terebra* shortly exerted. Length $2\frac{3}{4}$ mm., expands 6 mm.

Described from two males and twelve females.

Cocoons white, woolly, affixed to a stem of grass in a rather compact, irregular bunch without external covering (fig. 4). Differs from *congestus* in that the *terebra* is twice as long and the cocoons totally different; from *vestalis* in that the scutellum is smoother, *terebra* longer, and ventral valve smaller; from *ruficrus* in having the fore coxæ dark and not testaceous, etc.; and from *tetricus* in that the *terebra* is longer, third abdominal segment not rugulose, and legs much lighter.

During the first week in July, 1908, I found a bunch of some twenty cocoons firmly attached to a stout stem of grass some six inches above the ground; from these, on the 11th of the month, I obtained imagines of a species which I at first took to be *congestus*, though I could not account for the difference in the cocoons; careful examination, however, revealed several differences in structure, etc. I have never met with the species since.

Writing of *congestus*, Rheinhard* mentions that when the insect inhabits larvæ of *Melitea* the cocoons are without an external covering. It seems possible, therefore, that he was acquainted with *simulans*, but did not suspect it to be distinct from *congestus*, though, judging from the host, he may have had specimens of *vestalis* before him.

Rubecula, Marsh.†

A robust species, seemingly very near to *solitarius*, but differing therefrom in having infumated wings. A solitary parasite bred from young larvæ of *Hemaris fuciformis*, August 1st, 1903, and July 18th, 1911; also bred August 8th, 1911—in this case I found the cocoon attached to a cabbage-leaf. Bignell bred two from small larvæ of *Pieris rapæ*.‡ The larva of this parasite completes its metamorphosis within the cocoon in a period of seven or eight days. The cocoon is pale cream colour smooth, and somewhat wrinkled longitudinally; it is firmly affixed to a leaf of the food plant. I have known the host larva (*H. fuciformis*) to remain by the side of the cocoon, living but moribund, until some days after the emergence of the imago of the parasite.

Præpotens, Hal.§

A rather large species, distinguished by the short antennæ of the female (shorter than the body) and subexserted terebra and ventral valve. Length $2\frac{1}{2}$ – $3\frac{1}{2}$ mm., expands 6–8 mm.

In 1835 Haliday described the species as *præpotens*, and, in 1837, Wesmael, as *brevicornis*.|| We must, therefore, accept Haliday's name, though that given by Wesmael seems to fit the species the better. Marshall appears to have confused it with *sericcus*, Nees, owing probably to an unfortunate error made by Reinhard (see under *juniperatæ*). Haliday knew only the female, his description being as follows:

“Thorace subtilissime punctulato; tibiis ferrugineis, posticis apice fuscis; alis limpidis; aculeo perbrevis. *M. glomerato* major et adhuc robustior, antennis brevibus crassioribus; palporum et pedum coloris fere quales *M. intricato*, ketiores modo; alæ latæ apice rotundatæ (uti *M. glomerato*), limpidiæ, stigmatæ crasso nigro-ferrugineo, nervis disci nonnullis ut in illo interrupte ferrugineis, reliquis decoloribus, costâ interius flavicante; squamulæ nigre; thorax nitidus subtilissimè punctulatus; scutellum læve; metathorax brevissimus punctato-reticulatus; segmenta 2 anteriora ut in sequentibus latitudine subæqualia, aciculata; aculeus magis exsertus quam illis.”

* ‘Berl. ent. Zeit.,’ 1880, p. 369.

† ‘Trans. Entom. Soc.,’ 1885, p. 175.

‡ ‘Trans. Dev. Ass.,’ xxxiii, p. 670.

§ ‘Ent. Mag.,’ ii, p. 252.

|| ‘Nouv. Mem. Ac. Brux.,’ 1837, p. 50.

The first and second abdominal segments are rugulose, and there are generally some scattered punctures on the third.

The male does not differ in colouring or sculpture from the female: the antennæ, however, are as long as the body.

A solitary parasite having, it would appear, a partiality for larvæ of the genus *Eupithecia*.

The cocoon is a pale, dull, orange colour, almost smooth and slightly wrinkled; it is found firmly attached to a leaf or flower of the food plant.

In October, 1914, Major Robertson gave me a considerable number of the cocoons of this species, the makers having preyed upon larvæ of *Eupithecia expallidata* taken by him at Chandlers Ford. One imago emerged on November 11th, four on December 2nd, the remainder appearing between March 9th and April 28th, 1915. I have also bred the species from the larva of *E. nanata* (October 17th, 1914).

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS.

CALLOPHRYS AVIS AT CANNES.—In his notes on this species in the current number of the 'Entomologist' (1916, p. 151), Mr. Rowland-Brown refers to my papers of 1910 and 1912, and quotes them correctly, but almost implies that I include Cannes with Hyères as not furnishing *Coriaria myrtifolia*. This plant, however, is, according to my observations, and as stated in my 1912 paper, abundant at Cannes (or was), and I thought *C. avis* ought to occur there, but expressed my belief that nevertheless it did not, because it had never attracted any attention there; although Millière, Constant and many less notable entomologists had worked there. I had spent several spring seasons at Cannes and ought myself to have seen it, if there. Mr. Rowland-Brown's note is the first I have seen reporting the butterfly as occurring at Cannes; yet he quotes two authorities for it, but without any further details. My not knowing of the Gieseking collection may be due to my not having visited Cannes for, now, a good many years, but I am probably not alone in this ignorance. I should feel pleased if Mr. Rowland-Brown would tell us about it, and especially the data it supplies as to *C. avis*. Mr. Morris's observations, as being, I suppose, more recent and more fully and carefully made, it would also be very desirable to have on record. It would appear that my belief that *C. avis* does not occur at Cannes was erroneous, I think, it is obvious that I ought to have applied to this locality and the various entomologists that have collected there, the same views with which I began my paper in 1910, as to this very distinct and widely spread, if very local, butterfly having so long escaped notice.—H. CHAPMAN; Betula, Reigate, July, 1916.

NOTE ON DR. CHAPMAN'S REMARKS UPON CALLOPHRYS AVIS AT CANNES.—Certainly I assumed from Dr. Chapman's remarks on the food plant of *Callophrys avis* that he considered *Arbutus*, and not *Coriaria myrtifolia*, to be the food plant of the species on the Riviera.